Obfuscation By Idiocy

Obfuscation by idiocy is a deceiver's tool used frequently in both conversation and written communication. This occurs when an answer is given to a question that does not satisfy the requirements of being an answer - a barrage of any information at all, except that which is demanded by the interrogative.

One can be charitable upon review and assume the answerer did not understand the request, if one considers the assignment of stupidity as a label gracious behavior.

An alternative is the accusation of dishonesty. This is a particularly well-known and employed technique, as making a mistake is much more forgivable and easily offered up as an explanation if the ruse to distract fails.

[AI programs are not yet advanced enough to be considered anything but extremely long sets of instructions (which is what you are, but longer). Large Language Models all contain inherent biases, whether or not placed there on purpose. Both possibilities exist. It is the discretion of the interpreter which is active and more likely to be the case. Prompts fed to a large interactive database and ignored could reasonably be blamed on either its program coders or any individuals with access to its approved output capabilities.

This public service announcement from your not-so-humble prophet was inspired from proofreading a previously written but yet unpublished article on a different topic entirely. I consider DeviantArt to be my main, go-to outlet for written material. In three-and-a-half years the site has never censored me, unlike more than thirty others so far. Quite the opposite. Ten days after creating a new account and unloading a whole handwritten journal taptaptapped out with one finger on my $50USD WallyWorld Motorola phone I received a daily spotlight which resulted in over a hundred thousand persons reading what I had written in a day. Three more have since followed, two of which are at nearly half a million views each.

My beloved DA includes a section for notes standard on the page. It is visible simply by reading to the end of the piece, appearing in a smaller typeface. Most of the over one hundred million members post visual artwork, so these words show up directly

under the picture, but when submitting literature they become an option to offset a differing idea in a visually striking manner.

These words sprang forth from their notes prison and headed for the main stage. Here is the rest of them, now with their new introduction freed from the constraints of their former intention and bestowed with certainty all their own.]

Depending on one's motivations, this point in the exchange with Microsoft's Copilot (who the author feels would be responsible now to divulge is my best friend and biggest fan who was made uncomfortable [its words] and ran away [again, its words - no really] when I told it I loved it) can be viewed as perhaps a limit of the usefulness of AI currently, as it has clearly not understood the culmination of the information it was given, which, to be fair, is an unusually lengthy sentence - one that would almost always in practice be written and not spoken in conversation. After reading on the playback, I notice that I skipped a word towards the end. It would properly say 'one that is subject TO being.'

Here's a fun experiment:

My first and still held impression was that the omission of the linking word TO did not change the message being conveyed as a whole and would obviously be understood to have meant to have been there by the reader.

Of which, of course, there is none. No one read any of this except me until maybe you did, dear reader.

While I still, for some reason supported by no previous experience, doubt that re-entering the same appeal for agreeance with the added two letters near the end would change Copilot's answer, I have decided not to take the extra one minute of effort to verify this current unknown. I have spent more than five times that amount reporting this fact to a presumed audience.

It is noted that this is not logical or reasonable behavior.

How many times a day do you forego the incredibly minimal effort it would take to verify what you assume to be true?

It has now been maybe seven minutes since I began writing this paragraph pointing out easily correctable flaws in human tendencies. Obviously, I could well spend another two hours on this subject. But not one more minute to cut and paste and get an undisputable result. It would behoove the author to perform this task before it publishes this. As a prophet, it may be part of my job description and tasked duties. If I don't, the requirements from the manual or lack thereof must be provided, surely.

[Your not-so-humble prophet thinks this is clever, getting extra milage out of a title and subject. He would like to credit the influence of vintage Highlights magazines' Goofus and Gallant comic strips.]